



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

DACZEW

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

John P. Halvonik
806 W. Diamond Avenue
Suite 301
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

COPY MAILED

JUN 20 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Frank Abdullovski
Application No. 09/735,193
Filed: December 11, 2000
Attorney Docket No. N/A

RECEIVED:
OIPE/IAP :

JUL 01 2005

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a), filed August 24, 2004, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

Any further petition to revive must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Petition under 37 CFR 1.137." This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply, unless previously filed;¹ (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(l); (3) a showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(a) was unavoidable; and (4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c). The instant petition lacks item (3).

A non-final Office action was mailed to applicant on December 8, 2003, which set a three-month shortened statutory period for reply. Since no reply was received and no extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 were obtained, the application became abandoned on March 9, 2004.

¹ In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

Petitioner alleges that the office action of December 8, 2003 was never received. However, petitioner has not provided any evidence to support the allegation made in the petition.

The showing of record is not sufficient to establish to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 133 and 37 CFR 1.137(a). See MPEP 711(c)(III)(C)(2) for a discussion of the requirements for a showing of unavoidable delay. Specifically, an application is “unavoidably” abandoned only where petitioner, or counsel for petitioner, takes all action necessary for a proper response to the outstanding Office action, but through the intervention of unforeseen circumstances, such as failure of mail, telegraph, telefacsimile, or the negligence of otherwise reliable employees, the response is not timely received in the Office. Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm’r Pat. 31 (Comm’r Pat. 1887).

The showing required to establish non-receipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received by the practitioner and attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received. A copy of the docket record where the non-received Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement. See Withdrawing the Holding of Abandonment When Office Actions Are Not Received; Notice 1156 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 53 (November 16, 1993).

Petitioner must provide a copy of the docket record where the non-received Office communication would have been entered had it been received and a statement from the practitioner attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received to establish unavoidable delay.

Petitioner should consider filing a petition stating that the delay was unintentional. Public Law 97-247, § 3, 96 Stat. 317 (1982), which revised patent and trademark fees, amended 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) to provide for the revival of an “unintentionally” abandoned application without a showing that the delay in prosecution or in late payment of the issue fee was “unavoidable.” This amendment to 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) has been implemented in 37 CFR 1.137(b). An “unintentional” petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by the \$750 petition fee.

The filing of a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) cannot be intentionally delayed and therefore must be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:


By Mail:

Mail Stop PETITION
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand: U. S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Petitions
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

The centralized facsimile number is (703) 872-9306.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3223.


Marianne E. Jenkins
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Examination Policy